REMARKS

I.   Status

Claims 3-4, 19, and 36-38 have been amended. Also, claim 39 has been added. No new subject matter has been added as a result. Support for the amendments and new claim can be found on at least page 3, lines 27-28; page 4, lines 19-22 and page 5, lines 2-3 and Figure 1; page 6, line 26 – page 7, line 17 and page 8, lines 1-12 and Figure 2; and page 14, line 11 – page 16, line 2 (page 15, lines 15-16) and Figures 5-6. Claims 1, 9-10, 15-16, 20-22, and 24-35 have been previously canceled. Accordingly, claims 2-8, 11-14, 17-19, 23, and 36-39 are currently pending.

II.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 2-8, 11-14, 17-19, and 36 were rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. (Office Action, page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Independent claim 36 recites "providing an indication of the comparing," which would be considered a tangible result. See MPEP 706.03(a). However, in the interest of furthering prosecution, claim 36 has been amended to recite "the geographic database stored on data storage hardware." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

III.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2-8, 11-14, 17-19, 23, and 36-38 were rejected as being indefinite. (Office Action, page 4). The Examiner asserted that the recited steps are disjointed. Independent claims 36-38 have been amended, as shown above, to clarify the association between steps. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

Page 8 of 13

IV.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2-8, 11-14, 17-19, 23, and 36-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.
§102(b) as being anticipated by Muendel (WO 01/42809 A2).

Claim 36 and Dependents

Claim 36 recites, *inter alia*, "using a geographic database that contains data
that represents geographic features to compare geographic features of the first
course to geographic features In a second geographic area different from the first
geographic area, the geographic database stored on data storage hardware,"
"identifying, based on the comparison, data in the geographic database representing
geographic features in the second geographic area that substantially match the
geographic features of the first course," and "determining a second course located in
the second geographic area based on the identified data, the second course having
a substantially equivalent surface, a substantially equivalent length, and substantially
equivalent turns as the first course." Muendel does not teach or suggest at least
these features.

Muendel discloses a system for automatic monitoring of a real-time athletic
performance of a user. (Muendel, Abstract). Athletes preparing for a race with a
particular elevation profile might benefit from software that uses a digital elevation
model database to engineer a local training route that has a similar elevation profile
to that of the race. (Muendel, page 18, lines 23-25). Furthermore, in some cases, a
virtual competition can be held whereby users at different locations and/or at
different times can conduct a virtual competition. (Muendel, Abstract). For example,
multiple competitors can wear training devices and complete respective courses at
different locations. (Muendel, page 28, lines 1-10). Once all the competitors' results
are sent to a server computer and stored in a data buffer, the server computer
determines a "winner" taking any number of different approaches, such as
considering age, weight, etc. as well as using other weighting factors. (Muendel,
page 28, lines 14-19). A winner flag can be provided to indicate the winner.
(Muendel, page 28, lines 19-20).

However, there is no teaching or suggestion of using a geographic database
to determine a differently located second course having a substantially equivalent
surface, a substantially equivalent length, and substantially equivalent turns as the

first course. Muendel discloses that a digital elevation model database may be used
to engineer a local training route that has a similar elevation profile to that of a race
course. However, just having a similar elevation profile is not the same as using a
geographic database to determine a course having a substantially equivalent
surface, a substantially equivalent length, and substantially equivalent turns as
another course located in a different area.

Accordingly, claim 36 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 2-8, 11-
14, and 17-19 depend, directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 36 and, therefore,
are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 37 and Dependents

Claim 37 recites, *inter alia*, "a geographic database that contains data that
represents geographic features in a first geographic area and a second geographic
area different from the first geographic area, the data representing the geographic
features include data representing connectivity of roads, address ranges along the
roads, street names of the roads, and geographic coordinates of positions of the
roads." Muendel does not teach or suggest at least these features.

Muendel discloses a system for automatic monitoring of a real-time athletic
performance of a user. (Muendel, Abstract). Athletes preparing for a race with a
particular elevation profile might benefit from software that uses a digital elevation
model database to engineer a local training route that has a similar elevation profile
to that of the race. (Muendel, page 18, lines 23-25). Furthermore, in some cases, a
virtual competition can be held whereby users at different locations and/or at
different times can conduct a virtual competition. (Muendel, Abstract). For example,
multiple competitors can wear training devices and complete respective courses at
different locations. (Muendel, page 28, lines 1-10). Once all the competitors' results
are sent to a server computer and stored in a data buffer, the server computer
determines a "winner" taking any number of different approaches, such as
considering age, weight, etc. as well as using other weighting factors. (Muendel,
page 28, lines 14-19). A winner flag can be provided to indicate the winner.
(Muendel, page 28, lines 19-20).

However, there is no teaching or suggestion of using a geographic database
that includes data representing connectivity of roads, address ranges along the

Page 10 of 13

roads, street names of the roads, and geographic coordinates of positions of the roads.

Accordingly, claim 37 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claim 23 depends from allowable claim 37 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 38

Claim 38 recites, *inter alia*, "providing an indication of the comparing of the first and the second performances to the first participant during the first performance." Muendel does not teach or suggest at least these features.

Muendel discloses a system for automatic monitoring of a real-time athletic performance of a user. (Muendel, Abstract). Athletes preparing for a race with a particular elevation profile might benefit from software that uses a digital elevation model database to engineer a local training route that has a similar elevation profile to that of the race. (Muendel, page 18, lines 23-25). Furthermore, in some cases, a virtual competition can be held whereby users at different locations and/or at different times can conduct a virtual competition. (Muendel, Abstract). For example, multiple competitors can wear training devices and complete respective courses at different locations. (Muendel, page 28, lines 1-10). Once all the competitors' results are sent to a server computer and stored in a data buffer, the server computer determines a "winner" taking any number of different approaches, such as considering age, weight, etc. as well as using other weighting factors. (Muendel, page 28, lines 14-19). A winner flag can be provided to indicate the winner. (Muendel, page 28, lines 19-20).

However, there is no teaching or suggestion of providing an indication of the comparing of first and second performances to a first participant during the first performance. Muendel discloses that after all of the competitors' results are sent to the server computer, the server computer then determines the winner. Accordingly, the winner flag or indication disclosed by Muendel is provided after the competitors' performances, not during a performance. Page 14, lines 22-25 of Muendel mention that training modes include a pre-planned workout mode where a trainer device, in real-time, updates the user's current speed and based on data stored in a memory, provides real time feedback to speed up or slow down. Yet, the training mode

concerns an individual's pre-planned workout and is not the same as analyzing or comparing different performances along separate courses at different locations. Muendel specifically mentions that comparisons and indications thereof of different performances on separate courses are done after all the results are sent to a server computer, not during a performance.

Accordingly, claim 38 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claim 39

Claim 39 recites, *inter alia*, "using a geographic database that contains data that represents geographic features to identify geographic features in the first geographic area," "determining the course based on the identified geographic features in the first geographic area," "forming simulated route information for movement on a stationary device located in a second geographic area different from the first geographic area," "providing the simulated route information to the stationary device, wherein the simulated route information causes the stationary device to simulate substantially equivalent geographic features of the course including selecting a substantially same distance to move upon the stationary device as covered by the course and changing incline of the stationary device to substantially match changes in incline of the course," "comparing the first performance to a second performance, wherein the second performance is on the stationary device based on the simulated route information," and "providing an indication of the comparing of the first and the second performances to the participant."   Muendel does not teach or suggest these features. Accordingly, claim 39 is allowable.

Furthermore, one or more of the dependent claims recite features that may be independently allowable.

V.   Summary

It is respectfully asserted that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited reference(s), and allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Adil M. Musabji
Reg. No. 58,728
Patent Counsel

NAVTEQ North America, LLC
425 West Randolph Street
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 780-3054

Page 13 of 13